

REMARKS

Claims 1-10, 12-31, 33-36, and 38-40 are now pending in the application. Claim 5 is amended herein to correct a typographical error. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejection in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

TELEPHONIC INTERVIEW

The Examiner is respectfully thanked for the Telephonic Interview of March 30, 2007. During the interview, no demonstrations were conducted, nor exhibits given. The references over the independent claims relative to the Protzmann reference were discussed.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-7, 9-10, 12-23, 25-30, 33-36, and 38-40 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over D. E. Protzmann (U.S. Pat. No. 3,159,446). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 is non-obvious and patentable over the Protzmann reference because the Protzmann reference does not include a through opening as called for in claim 1. Specifically, claim 1 calls for "said support member having at least one through opening that is used to attach said first cable to said support member." (Emphasis added). In contrast, the Protzmann reference does not disclose such a through opening.

In the Office Action, the Examiner equates the openings in the face of electrical socket 12 as being through openings. See page 2, the last 5 lines, and page 3, lines 3-5 of the Office Action. The openings in electrical socket 12, however, are not through openings. Rather, openings 12 lead to interior cavities of electrical socket 12 that allow

the prongs of plug 19 to electrically connect to the cable/wires that are attached to plug 12 on the side thereof with screws. See at least Figures 1 and 2 of the Protzmann reference. The openings in socket 12, however, do not extend through electrical socket 12. Rather, those openings appear to lead to closed cavities within which the prongs of plug 19 can be inserted. Furthermore, closed cavities are not through openings. Applicant is not aware of any electrical sockets, either the ones in Protzmann or otherwise, wherein the openings in the receptacle are through openings. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that the openings in electrical socket 12 are not through openings in that they do not extend completely through electrical socket 12. As such, it is respectfully submitted that the Examiner is mistaken as to the existence of through openings in the Protzmann reference and, accordingly, has not made a prima facie case of obviousness in rejecting claim 1.

Furthermore, Applicant is unaware of how any other meaning to the term "through opening" can be understood. As shown in Figure 3 of Applicant's instant application, the openings extend through the support member such that they extend from one side of the support member all the way through to the opposite side thereof. This is in direct contrast to the closed cavities formed by the openings in electrical socket 12.

Accordingly, for at least this reason it is respectfully submitted that claim 1 is non-obvious and patentable over the prior art of record. Claims 2-7, 9-10, 12-17, and 38 all depend from claim 1 and, therefore, are also non-obvious and patentable over the prior art of record. Thus, withdrawal of the instant rejection is requested.

Applicant also respectfully submits that claim 18 is non-obvious and patentable over the Protzmann reference because the Protzmann reference fails to teach, suggest, or provide motivation to pass a cable through an access opening formed by an offset portion of the cover plate that extends along an edge of the cover plate as called for in claim 18. In rejecting this claim, the Examiner states that the Protzmann reference discloses a plate 25 with 25a being an offset portion. First, the component identified as 25 in Protzmann is not a plate. Rather, it is a cylindrical sphere-like component. Second, the alleged offset portion 25a is an opening in component 25. See column 2, lines 16-17 of the Protzmann reference. An opening is not an offset portion as called for in claim 18. Furthermore, the cord 18 that extends through opening 25a is also not an offset portion. Third, alleged offset portion 25a is not along an edge of the cover plate (alleged plate 25). Rather, opening 25a is disposed in a relatively central portion of component 25. Alleged offset portion 25a does not extend along an edge of component 25. Thus, the Protzmann reference does not disclose, teach, suggest, or provide motivation to arrive at the subject matter of claim 18.

Furthermore, in rejecting claim 18, the Examiner appears to have completely ignored the requirement of the offset portion to extend along an edge of the cover plate. In fact, Applicant can find no reference whatsoever in the rejection addressing this part of claim 18. Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to distinctly point out and explain how or where an offset portion that extends along an edge of a plate is shown in the Protzmann reference. Absent such a showing, the Examiner has failed to make a prima facie case of obviousness by not having addressed the entire subject matter of claim 18.

Thus, for at least these reasons, it is respectfully submitted that claim 18 is non-obvious and patentable over the prior art of record. Claims 19-28 all depend from claim 18 and, therefore, are also non-obvious and patentable over the Protzmann reference. Thus, withdrawal of the instant rejection is requested.

Turning now to claim 29, it is respectfully submitted that claim 29 is non-obvious and patentable over the Protzmann reference because the Protzmann reference fails to teach, suggest, or motivate one skilled in the art to connect first and second electrical cables together on opposite sides of a support member wherein each of the electrical cables extends from different sides of an opening in a panel. Specifically, claim 29 calls for "connecting a second electrical cable that extends from a second side of said opening in the panel of the aircraft to said first cable from an opposite side of said support member." (Emphasis added). Thus, in claim 29 there are two cables that each come from different sides of a panel. These two cables are electrically conductively connected to one another through opposite sides of the support member.

In rejecting this claim, the Examiner has not addressed the requirement of the cables being connected together from opposite sides of the support member. In fact, Applicant cannot find any reference to the subject matter of claim 29 in the detailed action. Moreover, as Applicant pointed out in the response filed on November 20, 2006, the Protzmann reference discloses that electric cables can be attached to a side of duplex receptacle 11 with screws while plug 19 can be inserted into an adjacent side of duplex receptacle 11 through slots in electrical socket 12. Moreover, the slots in socket 12 and the screws on receptacle 11 are not on opposite sides. Rather, the slots in socket 12 and the screws in the side of receptacle 11 are on adjacent sides which

appear to be in planes that are 90 degrees apart. Adjacent sides are not opposite sides of the support member as called for in claim 29.

With the Protzmann reference failing to disclose this subject matter and with the Office Action failing to address this subject matter, it is respectfully submitted that the Examiner has failed to make a prima facie case of obviousness and that claim 29 is non-obvious and patentable over the prior art of record. If the Examiner insists on maintaining this rejection, the Examiner is respectfully requested to specifically point out where the Protzmann reference teaches, shows, or motivates one skilled in the art to have the two electrical cables connected together through opposite sides of the support member. Absent such a showing, the instant rejection cannot be maintained.

For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 29 is non-obvious and patentable over the Protzmann reference. Claims 30-34 and 39 all depend from claim 29 and, therefore, are also non-obvious and patentable over the Protzmann reference. Thus, withdrawal of the instant rejection is requested.

Claim 35 is non-obvious and patentable over the Protzmann reference because the Protzmann reference does not teach, suggest, or motivate one skilled in the art to attach cables that extend from different sides of a panel to one another on a same side of a support member. Specifically, claim 35 calls for "connecting a second cable that extends from a second side of the opening in the panel to said first cable so that said first and second cables are connected to one another on a same side of said support member." (Emphasis added). Thus, cables from different sides of the panel are connected together on a same side of a support member.

In rejecting this claim, the Examiner states that "it would have been an obvious matter of design choice to connect another clock or other electrical device such as a computer monitor to 13 as a second cable to connect on the same side of 12 and 13 for the purpose of providing electrical power to more than one electronic devices." See the Office Action, page 2, second to the last line – page 3, line 2. In making this statement, however, the Examiner appears to have failed to address the requirement that the cables come from different sides of the panel. That is, the first cable is specifically stated as extending from a first side of an opening in the panel while the second cable is specifically stated as extending from a second side of the opening in the panel. Thus, the cables come from different sides of the panel and are attached to one another on a same side of the support member.

In looking at the Protzmann reference, it appears as though the two receptacles 12, 13 of duplex receptacle 11, are on a same side and that attaching another cable to the unused receptacle would be another cable on a same side of panel 15 as the cable 19 currently is shown. That is, the Examiner's suggestion that to attach another electrical device to the unused socket does not address the requirement of the two cables to come from different sides of the panel (panel 15). Moreover, the Protzmann reference does not disclose the subject matter of claim 35.

Thus, it is respectfully submitted that the Examiner has failed to make a prima facie case of obviousness by not having addressed the entire subject matter of claim 35. Moreover, it is respectfully submitted that the Protzmann reference does not teach, suggest, or provide motivation to arrive at the subject matter called for in claim 35. If the Examiner wishes to maintain this rejection, the Examiner is respectfully requested to

specifically point out where cables from different sides of panel 15 can be connected together on the same side of a support member as called for in claim 35. Absent such a showing, the instant rejection cannot be maintained.

For at least these reasons, it is respectfully submitted that claim 35 is non-obvious and patentable over the prior art of record. Claims 36 and 40 both depend from claim 35 and, therefore, are also non-obvious and patentable over the Protzmann reference. Thus, withdrawal of the instant rejection is requested.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: April 3, 2007

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

JHU/ps

By: 
Jeffrey H. Urian, Reg. No. 46,232